

1 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

11 EDWARD RANDOLPH
12 TURNBULL, IV,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.
15 OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY
16 COUNSEL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:23-cv-001619-RAJ
ORDER

17 I. INTRODUCTION

18 THIS MATTER is before the Court on a Motion to Seal filed by the WSBA
19 Defendants.¹ Dkt. # 29. Plaintiff does not oppose this request. For the reasons set forth
20 below, the Court **GRANTS** WSBA Defendants' Motion. Dkt. # 29

21
22
23 ¹ The "WSBA Defendants" consist of the WSBA's Office of Disciplinary Counsel; WSBA disciplinary attorneys
24 Chief Disciplinary Counsel Doug Ende and Managing Disciplinary Counsel Craig Bray; the Disciplinary Board,
25 including former review committee members Lisa Marsh, Natividad Valdez, and Gerald Kroon; and current and
26 former members of the WSBA's Board of Governors, including Hunter M. Abell, Daniel D. Clark, Francis Adewale,
Tom Ahearne, Sunitha Anjilvel, Todd Bloom, Lauren Boyd, Jordan Couch, Matthew Dresden, Kevin Fray[sic], P.J.
Grabicki, Carla Higginson, Erik Kaeding, Russell Knight, Kristina Larry, Rajeev Majumdar, Tom McBride, Nam
Nguyen, Bryn Peterson, Kari Petrasek, Brett Purtzer, Mary Rathbone, Serena Sayani, KyleCichetti, Alec Stephens,
Brian Tollefson, Allison Widney, and Brent Williams-Ruth.

II. **LEGAL STANDARD**

Under the local rules, there is “a strong presumption of public access to the court’s files.” Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 5(g). Pursuant to Local Rule 5(g), the party who designates a document confidential must provide a “specific statement of the applicable legal standard and the reasons for keeping a document under seal, including an explanation of: (i) the legitimate private or public interest that warrant the relief sought; (ii) the injury that will result if the relief sought is not granted; and (iii) why a less restrictive alternative to the relief sought is not sufficient.” LCR 5(g)(3)(B). The party seeking to seal a judicial record must show that “compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings . . . outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.” *Kamakana v. City of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006).

III. DISCUSSION

On August 23, 2024, the Court denied the WSBA Defendants' Motions to Seal without prejudice and with leave to re-file. Dkt. #28 at 1. The Court determined that Defendants demonstrated a legitimate interest that warrants the relief sought and the possible injury that would result if the relief sought wasn't granted. *Id.* at 2-3. However, the Court determined the parties failed to demonstrate that protecting the information could not be accomplished by less restrictive means. *Id.* The Court has reviewed the newly proposed targeted redactions. The Court is satisfied that the re-filed redactions meet the standards set forth in the local rules. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** WSBA Defendants' Motion to Seal. Dkt. # 29.

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**
2
3

4 For the reasons discussed above, the Court **GRANTS** the Motion to Seal. Dkt. # 29.
5
6 The Motion to Dismiss, Dkt. # 32, shall remained sealed on the docket.

7 Dated this 12th day of September, 2024.
8
9
10

11 
12

13 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26